DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 195 041 EA 013 137

AUTHOR Karr-Kidwell, P. J.: Makay, John J.
TITLE A Rhetorical Perspective of the Progressive Education Movement.
PUB DATE May 80
NOTE 41p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Beliefs: Democratic Values: Educational Change: Educational History: Educational Objectives: Educational Philosophy: Educational Theories: Experimental Curriculum: Group Membership: Organization: Organizational Objectives: *Organizations (Groups): Persuasive Discourse: *Progressive Education: *Rhetoric: School Community Relationship: Student Centered Curriculum

ABSTRACT

This paper looks at how rhetoric was used as an instrument in the Progressive Education Movement. According to the author, this movement stretched from the early 1920s to the early 1950s. As part of it, educators placed increased emphasis on child development, the student's freedom to develop naturally, student motivation, and the school/community relationship. The essay uses a rhetorical perspective to show that discourse worked to fuel the movement's growth until it reached a period of consummation. After tracing early developmental stages of the movement, the author focuses on the rise of the movement from local to national recognition. He notes the lack of agreement about ideological concerns within the movement and adds a note on how confusion in purpose led to the movement's demise. A rhetorical analysis of the movement is then offered, focusing on three areas: the shared beliefs or sense of community among members evidenced through referential symbols and rhetorical appeals, members' norms for action (both intentional and unintentional action), and the internal and external rhetoric of the organizational structure of the movement and how this affected the organizations's objectives and actions. (Author/JM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A Rhetorical Perspective of the Progressive Education Movement

ED195041

BY

P.J. Karr-Kidwell
Texas Woman's University

and

John J. Makay
Ohio State University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P. J. Karr-Kidwell

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 013 137

A RHETORICAL PERSPECTIVE OF THE PROGRESSIVE EDUCATION MOVEMENT

Leland Griffin was among the first scholars of rhetoric to describe how rhetoric can be examined in a historical movement.[1] He put forth basic stages' movements apparently go through: the period of inception, rhetorical crisis, and consummation. Within these periods, rhetoric is instrumental to serving both maintenance goals as well as ultimate external objectives. Some movements are described as establishment-conflict collectivities as evidenced by the Civil Rights Movement and the Peace Movement of the 1960's. The Progressive Education Movement and others with similar characteristics are best described as innovational movements. The latter kind of movement differs from the former because the establishment-conflict voices call for a reconstitution of society's values while the innovational movement asks for changes without opposing the primary values of society.[2]

Social movements, whether establishment-conflict or innovational have been instrumental in bringing about change in America in a variety of unique ways and the creation of change is in large part a response to the rhetoric of the particular movements. Of special interest and importance to educators is the Progessive Education Movement, a collectivity whose life was initiated and sustained by rhetoric until the movement reached its final stage. "Rhetoric," Wayne Brockriede tells us, "includes experiences involving written as well as spoken discourse, nonverbal as well as verbal symbols, movements as well as individual events, and functions other than those implied by a narrow conception of persuasion. Rhetoric is the relationship of persons within a situation."[3] We are concerned with rhetoric as an instrument of the Progressive Education Movement to bring about change in American Education.

OCT 2 8 1980

A great deal has been said and written about the Progressive Education Movement in the early 1920's, a movement which altered pedagogical philosophies and practices in our nation's schools. Through this Movement educators became concerned with child development, freedom to develop naturally, motivation, and the school/community relationship rather than classical curriculum concerns which predominated the early 1900's. To provide a broader and richer base for understanding the Progressive Education Movement this essay aims at a rhetorical perspective showing that discourse worked to fuel the movement's growth until it reached a period of consummation. To achieve this aim, the Progressive Education Movement is treated within a historical frame-reference and analyzed rhetorically as an innovational movement.[4]

A Historical Frame of Reference for the Progressive Education Movement

Many of the educational reforms which were interrupted by World War I were resumed after the war. During the peaceful times which followed the war, it became clear that educational leaders were still committed to the experimental rather than traditional concerns.[5] For example, the founders of the PEA in 1919 were still committed to carrying out many pre-war reforms which dealt with new pedagogical philosophy and educational practices.

The pre-war educational reforms addressed primarily vocational and technical concerns, but continued to expand into medical and hygiene programs and areas requiring community involvement in order to fulfill both societal demands and the diverse needs of children in education. Additionally, the new psychology affected educational reform. For example, after reading William James', Principles of Psychology, Dewey proposed that thought and action, knowing and doing could not be separated. Thus, ideas were considered instruments of action, rather than objects of contemplation as they had been in the past.[6] Based upon this contention by Dewey, many

educators acted upon these "new ideas" rather than contemplating about them, and action upon new ideas became the new motto for many educators. This motto was indicative of the post-war educational reforms which prevailed for the next thirty years.

The post-war reforms were manifested in many middle-upper class private and public schools. For example, the concern of many community members for quality education led to the development of schools which were even organized by parents.[7] To insure the development of such quality education programs, teacher education programs began to emphasize professional courses and certification as necessary requirements for appropriate teacher training. Additionally, the dissemination of new ideas associated with the Progressive Education Movement was guaranteed as more educational institutions implemented these program changes. Due to these changes, the Progressive Education Movement was increasingly dominated by professional educators.[8] We can understand these educators and their primary concerns along with their implementation of educational reforms, and the impact of such reforms, through a historical account of (1) the early developmental stages of the movement, (2) the rise from local to national recognition, (3) the uncertainty of ideological concerns and (4) the confusions in purpose which led to the decline of the Progressive Education Movement.

Early Developmental Stages of the Movement

To promote the ideas generated at the inception of the Progressive Education Movement, the PEA was founded in 1919. To many who attended this meeting, it represented a dream come true. The chief organizer, Stanwood Cobb, had broken from the traditional, formal education after many years to help establish the PEA and begin his own progressive school, the Chevy Chase Country Day School in Maryland. Both the credibility of the

spokespersons and the ideas generated by those affiliated with the Progressive Education Movement were enhanced by the development of this professional association.

The search for additional members, adequate funds and common goals was initiated with the birth of this association. The campaigns for additional members were successful, increasing the membership in 1919 from 86 to 7,400 in the ear'y 1930's. This rise in membership was due in part to the well-known persons associated with the movement and association. For example, the president of Harvard, Charles Eliot, was nominated honorary president of the association. Certainly, his acceptance of this position gave the organization prestige.[9] With adequate membership, the next move was to secure funds. Initial funds were obtained by membership fees. Additional grants from Mrs. Parsons and Mrs. Williams as well as volunteer time and effort of several members minimized some of the financial problems. The association's total income was $1270 the first year whereas the fourth year it was $3691.[10] However, the members realized that recognition of the ideas which characterized the Progressive Education Movement was needed. In essence, this meant widespread and consistent publicity coverage, which meant more funds. Thus, the contributions of wealthier members of the organization were sought. In 1924, Mrs. Aver, financed the association's journal, Progressive Education. With adequate membership and funds, the designing of a program representative of the common goals had to be considered.

There was widespread agreement among members concerning the inadequacy of the traditional schools, but consensus about more specific goals was difficult to achieve. To begin the latter task, Eugene Smith was appointed the head of a committee charged with rhetorical responsibility. The committee designated that the bulletin which made communication with a widespread

audience possible, should list the aims of the association. More specifically, these aims were (1) to communicate the principles of the Progressive Education Movement through media, a representative journal, newspaper, and magazines articles, (2) to educate the public by communicating the platforms of the Progressive Education Movement, and (3) to provide services as an exchange bureau to both laymen and educators.[11] By 1920, these aims were given heightened and specific attention in the PEA constitution.[12] These specific principles were retained for almost a decade before revision of the principles was published.

Three major concerns--membership, adequate funding, and common goals--were soon superseded by another concern-conventions, which helped to popularize the Progressive Education Movement in general. Topics relating to the reactions of public schools to Progressive Education Movement, the freedom of children, and the aims of associations were discussed. These concerns in the early years marked the uncertainty and quest of the Progressive Education Movement. The movement had a name, an association to support it, support of increasing members, financial assistance, and a tentative program.[13]

The Rise from Local to National Recognition

Three factors contributed to the acceptance of both the Association and the Movement. First, an attractive, imaginative, and informative journal which appeared consistently enhanced the reputation of the association and the movement. Second, the appointment of Morton Snyder to the position of Executive Secretary directed attention to the public schools as well as the private experimental schools. Thus, the ideas of progressive education became more widespread. Third, the death of Charles Eliot, Honorary President of the Association, created a vacancy which was filled by John Dewey. Certainly, the ethos of the Association and Movement was elevated with the appointment of John Dewey.

Soon other educational organizations invited members of PEA to participate in activities. By 1928, many representatives of leading progressive schools, colleges, and other institutions showed a genuine interest in the PEA and the movement, whereas a few years before, PEA met with more conservatism. This genuine interest in PEA continued, as evidenced by the contributions of these people in Progressive Education. Similar to the ideas of the Association and Movement, their contributing papers emphasized child-centeredness, freedom, and creativity. Conferences were also a further indication of heightened interest in these areas.[14] For example, at the 1928 conference the rhetoric of Dewey stressed to the members of the Association not only these ideas in progressive education but also his notions of the science of education.

Dewey argued that this science of education which he referred to as the philosophy of education could describe a theoretical, intellectual rationale for progressive education. Dewey urged that schools order subject matter along intellectual lines and that educators study conditions favorable to learning. By addressing the overall intellectual aspects of the school, Dewey inspired those educators concerned with curriculum reform.

Although the PEA remained small in size, by 1929 it was a "power group" in American education.[15] For example, Margaret Naumberg, Lucy Mitchell, and Harold Rugg who advocated child-centered education added power because they also were active participants in the broader intellectual life of the nation.[16] More specifically, Mrs. Mitchell, who worked at a progressive school and established the Bureau of Educational Experiments, had contacts in areas of business research and economics. These advocates of child-centeredness enhanced the growth of the movement. It was the child-centered aspects that attracted followers continually from a variety of sources. There were five other rhetorical influences which aided the growth of the movement.

The first was the monthly rather than the quarterly publication of Progressive Education. The need to focus on one particular theme was reduced, due to the frequency of the publication, although focusing on theme articles was revived periodically. The journal contained not only articles by leading progressive educators but also portions of representative books of the ideas of progressive education; these were Beale's A History of the Freedom of Teaching in the United States, Bode's Progressive Education at the Crossroads, and Curti's The Social Ideas of American Education.

The second influence was PEA's sponsorship of conferences to popularize progressive education. More specifically, summer workshops, regional conferences, local meetings, "work-study" conventions, and group discussions were carried out. It was these events which increased the number of people who attended the annual conventions. For example, in 1936, over 4,500 people attended the annual meeting.[17] Additionally, the nationally-known speakers who attended these conferences, annual and regional, increased the support of progressive education ideas. Some of these nationally-known speakers also offered annual summer campus programs which many educators at the public school and college level attended.[18]

The third influence was the publication of major speeches from the annual conferences under the title of Progressive Education Booklets. In addition, other speeches and debates between many nationally-known educators associated with the Movement were broadcast over the radio in 1930, 1931, and 1938.

The fourth influence was the use of research in education. The PEA's first research attempts required the formation of the Committee on the Relation of School and College, directed by Wilford Aikin. Grants from private schools, Carnegie Corporation's Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and the General Education Board supported the initial research endeavors.

By 1934, this committee had become a commission; the change was indicative of increasing prestige.[19] Due to the success of this commission, other committees were formed during the 1930's. More specifically, these committees dealt with the creation of adequate and valid guides to a "progressive" education, human relations, federal support, cultural relations, training, preparation, and education of teachers, school-community relations, and child development.

The fifth influence was the formal affiliation of PEA with the New Educational Fellowship (NEF), a British organization associated with progressive education. Although the PEA had continually refused to merge with NEF in the 1920's, the association was now strong and independent with few worries concerning the possible dominance of NEF or misuse of joint funds. The PEA's official support of NEF was maintained, but more enthusiasm for home-based activities were apparent.[20]

Clearly, these rhetorical influences contributed to both the growth of the membership which reached 10,000 in 1938, and the professional recognition by many magazines. So, the culmination of the work of many educators involved in the Progressive Education Movement and PEA was reached. Their intense commitments and rhetorical efforts over the years produced the "flowering" of the movement by the late 1930's.

Uncertainty of Ideological Concerns

Progressive education held a variety of meanings for many educators. The failure to deal with the fragmentation of philosophies which reoccurred over the thirty-six year period eventually led to disagreement, confusion, and finally deterioration of the Progressive Education Movement and an era.

Bode deals specifically with the major issues related to the fragmentation of the Movement in his book, Progressive Education at the Crossroads. For example, he contends that the tranquillity of the 1920's was

replaced by the need to do something--to have a commitment to active participation in national life. However, the educators varied in their commitments from changing the curricula, subject matter, and teaching methods to the other extreme, social reconstruction. Thus, even the principles of the constitution had to be discarded as such divergent pressures increased.

The educators advocating social reconstruction tended to follow George Counts whose interest in the Soviet society and educational system caused him to question whether or not progressive education dare to be progressive or build a new social order. Counts proposed that progressive education should encompass the entire range of life: leisure and recreation, sex and family, government and public opinion. Similarly, Dewey in the School and Society and Rugg and Shumaker in The Child-Centered School were concerned with social reconstruction. By 1932, these pressures caused the Board of Directors and the Advisory Board to set up meetings to discuss "The Responsibility of Education for Social Reconstruction."[22] Kilpatrick who was the chairman of this meeting opened the discussion with three questions: (1) How shall we psychologically see the nature of educational progress? (2) How shall we see the social function of education and the direction of social progress? (3) How shall we administer education in light of these insights?[23] During 1932 and 1933 Counts' committee continued to address these questions by working on a draft of social policy for the schools. This report, which was published in 1934, concluded that teachers must unite in a powerful organization, devoted militantly to building a better social order to the fulfillment of the peoples' aspirations in a democratic society . . . should be one of the major purposes of PEA.[24] However, members of the Movement were unwilling to commit themselves to a proposal which they considered drastic. More specifically, the PEA was

reluctant to advocate this drastic proposal due to the possibility that their requests for future funding and grants would be refused.

Still another attempt to involve educators in social reconstruction and rebuilding in the schools was the consistent publication of The Social Frontier, a journal aimed at educational criticism and reconstruction. Although The Social Frontier and Progressive Education had some of the same people on each of their respective executive boards, the PEA declined continually a merger which The Social Frontier sought. Even with the PEA's denial of this merger, numerous letters and articles criticizing the PEA's new attitude and position were received. Thus, many teachers began to retreat from social change by turning to pedagogical concerns like curriculum revision or other non-political reforms.

During this period, the PEA's failure to state principles or delineate an ideology caused the Movement to become fragmented. More specifically, a dualism between thought and action existed. When this occurred, the PEA attempted to commit itself to the "schools of democracy" slogan by contending that "schools and institutions haven't made adequate provisions for those learning experiences effective in developing insight, attitudes, and skills essential to directing the evolution of democratic culture."[25] To accomplish these ends, PEA proposed six specific ways to reach this desired cultural direction: (1) support experiments which seek to conserve and expand democratic values, (2) support the teacher-training projects designed by the American Council on Education, (3) cooperate with similar groups in need of financial aid, (4) join organizations which improve social security via the use of democratic instruments for controlling changes, (5) protest authoritarianism and dictatorship, (6) and promote the "basic unity of mankind."[26] However, many of the other members of the association

failed to support this report. Thus, the fragmentation of the Progressive Education Movement continued.

Confusions in Purpose Lead to the End of the Progressive Education Movement

Many educators in the schools contended that the Association no longer had a statement of philosophy or purpose. Additionally, the leadership positions of the educators in the Association were dominated by narrow interest groups rather than the widespread and diverse leaders and interests of the previous years. For example, the selection of many Ohio State faculty members indicated that those educators representing the east were both limited and weakening.[27] To modify this deterioration, PEA attempted to state a systematic philosophy for the association. This failed to "rally the organization or to be taken seriously as the credo of the Progressive Education Movement."[28] Certainly, these factors and others led to the decline of the Progressive Education Movement.

The first factor was World War II. As a result of this, important commissions disbanded, financial support or grants were reduced, many reports were ignored, the representation of old PEA leaders was deteriorating and the publication of The Social Frontier which had been changed to the Frontiers of Democracy ceased. Last attempts to change the name of the association to the American Educational Fellowship to facilitate a broadening of activities and a rebirth of the progressive education failed.

A second factor was the decline in membership. "The leaders of the Progressive Education Movement itself increasingly disassociated themselves from the organization."[29] The same people who advocated the philosophy of progressive education throughout the 1920's and 1930's failed to support the Movement in the 1940's.[30] It was as if the ideas to support in the 1920's and 1930's were now the ideas not to support in the 1940's.

A third factor was the Association's change from educational commitment to an essentially political orientation under the leadership of DeBoer. Apparently this drove many members away and caused the Association to be labeled radical and socialist. However, with DeBoer's retirement in 1950, the new President, Kenneth Benne, tried to shift the emphasis to the same areas which brought the Progressive Education Movement to national recognition. At the same time, other members called for a re-examination of purposes. However, these issues were never really attended to. The last efforts of Benne and Hullfish, the last President of the PEA, depicted clearly the decline of an era characterized by intense commitment of many educators.

A Rhetorical Analysis of the Progressive Education Movement

Certainly, the intense commitment of many educators aided the rapid growth of the Progressive Education Movement. Their consistent efforts to modify their philosophy and practices with regard to the needs of the child and societal demands increased both the status and credibility of the Movement. Smith and Windes contend that if a movement is innovational the spokespersons for the movement will deny existence of a conflict between proposed innovations and the values of society; they will emphasize the weaknesses of traditional institutions and the strength of traditional values, and they will create a dialectic between its scene and purpose.[32] We see these strategies evident in the Progressive Education Movement. Our analysis of the Progressive Education Movement focuses on (1) the shared beliefs or sense of community among members, (2) their norms for action, and (3) the internal and external aspects of the organizational structure of the Progressive Education Movement. Additionally, each area is examined in detail. The first area, shared beliefs or a sense of community among

members, deals specifically with referential symbols, and rhetorical appeals; the second area, norms for action, deals specifically with collective behavior of the group characterized by intentional and unintentional actions; and the third area, the internal and external aspects of the organizational structure of the movement, deals specifically with the objectives, that which the organization does to achieve effectiveness. We are concerned with how the inherent conflict between the organization and the nature of individuals is minimized to enhance the satisfaction of members, the cultural forces, and the economic forces.

Shared Beliefs or Sense of Community Among Members

Following WWI, many educators voiced continually their concern for a change in educational institutions with regard to educational philosophy and practices, thus reflecting shared beliefs necessary for a dynamic movement. Gertrude Hartman contended that "if there's to be a new world civilization of peace, mutual understanding and sympathy, it must begin in the schools."[33] Other educators who voiced similar concerns began to gather together to discuss their ideas. These gatherings resulted in the development of the Progressive Education Association, or the PEA. Frederick Bonser indicated that, "establishing the PEA was the achievement of a need for integration or combination of isolated elements into a mutually helpful unity and a need for organized effort in promoting the purposes of progressive education so that all children might derive the benefits . . ."[34] Before long, other educators also began to feel the need to voice their ideas related to progressive education. Soon their mutual ideas began to strengthen their "sense of belonging." For example, Adolphe Ferriere indicated that these progressive schools were "laboratories of experimental pedagogy, using modern psychology methods and adopting to modern needs . . ."[35] Additionally, Francis Froelicher indicated that the "spirit of

experimentation and investigation is more prevalent in the teaching world than it ever has been in the past."[36] Furthermore, he contended that "it's practical and necessary for each one of us as teachers to consider the conditions that nourish and stimulate creativeness and to analyze the symptoms of its presence."[37] His contentions provided the stimulus to consider the creative impulses of the child. Soon after his contentions were made public, other educators who shared similar concerns spoke up. For example, Hugh Mearns indicated that:

> Education is at last learning to use the creative impulses. At present, it's experimenting and the results are good; it has no assured technique as yet but the beginnings are in sight. There's general agreement that the school life should be free from arrogant authorities; that teachers should be guides rather than instructors, and that these should be learning about children rather than certainty about children; that the school environment should be rich in suggesting material for the creative impulses.[38]

The arguments of these educators continued to inspire other educators to share beliefs and voice their own ideas and concerns. The arguments seemed directed at purposefully improving the scene so that rhetorical attacks were not directed at dominant groups or individuals in education. Instead the rhetorical strategy was aimed at achieving educational goals through the adoption of innovations of the Progressive Education Movement. Some educators were repetitious in their writings and speeches whereas other educators offered new insights with regard to educational philosophy and practices. Either way, their sense of belonging and shared beliefs were strengthened, for similar ideas became strong referential symbols for the members of the Movement and the PEA to follow. In a sense they were

creating an rhetorical vision, what Ernest Bormann describes as the composite drama which can catch up large groups of people in a symbolic reality. Neil Smelzer refers to this sort of action as the growth and spread of a generalized belief.[39]

Well known educators like William Kilpatrick, Eugene Smith, George Counts, George Mirick, Samuel Burr, Robert Lane, and Stanwood Cobb continued to project the rhetorical vision to strengthen a sense of belonging or community among members.[40] This sense of belonging in turn strengthened the Progressive Education Movement. Dramatically there was an indication from Kilpatrick that Progressive Education means to build its school on total effects-character, personality, and emotional effects it seeks to care for the whole child.[41] Count's rhetoric expounded on Kilpatrick's and his discourse contended that the Progressive Education Movement "focuses attention upon the child, recognizing the fundamental importance of the learner's interests; it posits that activity lies at the root of all education; it conceives learning in terms of life situations and character growth; and it champions the child's rights as a free personality."[42] Similarly Smith dealt with the progressive school in general, and the teacher specifically when he argued that progressive schools needed "teachers who are personalities . . . it's important that they should be able to make themselves felt by children through the rapport they're able to establish, by their ability to arouse and use interest, and by their genuineness of character and purpose."[43] Mirick considered the Progressive Education Movement generally and argued that it is not "a copy of the big world's life, but at best, a little world in which pupils live in accordance with nature's ways . . . the school is completely theirs."[44] He spoke of the differences of progressive schools more specifically when he charged that "every progressive school is different . . . such a school is fashioned

by the character, previous training, and mental abilities of pupils who make it up . . . fashioned by community influences active outside its walls."[45] Lastly, Cobb focused on the child in progressive education and he reminded his audiences that "the child is the starting point, the center, and the end . . . his development, his growth is the ideal, for it furnishes the standard."[46] Specifically, he argues that the progressive educator "approaches the child, not as an empty vessel waiting to be passively filled . . . but rather as a human being like himself, to be treated with courtesy, respect, and adequate understanding of a child's nature."[47] These were not new values about the education of children but the Progressive Education Movement's rhetoric did embody the strategy of working to show educators and other citizens that current institutional practices were weak in fulfilling the responsibilities and potentials bound into these values.

With these arguments the educators probably strengthened the "sense of community" and shared beliefs considerably among the members in the movement. Perhaps as a result many of the members began to join the PEA organization and formally strengthen their ideas and support for those ideas. The reason for such intense commitment to the Progressive Education Movement is a response to this "sense of community" among the members as indicated in their symbolic foci; regard for the whole child; child needs; creative impulses; and learners' interests. Ideally once the sense of community is formed within a movement, the themes of the spokespersons can be chained out to create a rhetorical vision to be of the ideology in society at large.

Rhetorical Appeals

We have viewed rhetorical appeals in the analysis of shared beliefs. Our focus now is to look more specifically at such statements to see them as indicative of the responses of movement leaders in the period of rhetorical crisis as perceived by spokespersons in the movement. Educators used appeals to gain support for ideas to adopt rhetorical progressive education, to provide a clearer perspective in terms of a direction for progressive education, and to delineate the common goals, purposes, and ideology with regard to the movement. For example, Gertrude Hartman's rhetoric responds with feeling to the exigence of the rhetorical situation when she spoke:

> . . ., before entering school we were shut away from the vivid world of reality. We were taught language which we were given little opportunity to use for social interaction; we learned indoor nature-study and geography and static history with never a notion that these studies had any connection with the things we loved out-of-doors or were in any way linked up with the concers of our daily living. Consequently, our pursuit of these subjects wasn't from an intrinsic interest in them, but from a derived interest of doing the thing required of us--an interest intimately connected with reward for success and punishment for failure . . . social tenets of old education were built upon the belief that there was an inherent opposition between individual and society, and that the interests of society could at best be served through repressing the individual. . . . we now realize that it's faulty thinking which created this opposition

> between the individual and society . . . we have discovered the happy fact that individuality is itself a social creation and we have come to regard the individual and social as simply two aspects of an integral relation.[48]

Her appeals perhaps aroused an audience-awareness of what progressive education was seeking in terms of the child and society. Additionally, she aimed her rhetoric in a specific direction when she declared that "at each level of achievement, the child proposes and solves problems of vital interest to him . . . thus it goes on day to day, year to year, and the educational content becomes broader and deeper and standards and techniques evolve."[49] Certainly, this provided educators with long-term results of practicing such a philosophy of education. Similarly, the annual conventions reinforced these ideas and often provided even more specific directions through the use of workshops and seminars. It wasn't long before many educators appeared aroused by these appeals and began to say, "let our motto be, for all children of the world, not quantity education, but quality education."[50] Similarly, Dewey spoke on quality education with rhetorical clarity and purpose when he contended that ". . . through education, society can formulate its own purposes, organize its own means and resources, and shape itself with definiteness and economy in the direction it wishes to move."[51]

Educators were soon inspired by these ideas and began to implement them in their schools. These educators continued to contribute to Progressive Education with regard to their success. By the 1925 conference, Eugene Smith's emotional appeal was an indication of the success by the rise in membership, commitment, and support of many educators to the progressive

education movement. He said, "I doubt if it would be possible to bring together a group of people more thoroughly imbued with relief of what they are doing and optimism regarding the future."[52] As teachers began to implement these ideas over the years, more writings regarding the excitement, inspiration, and knowledge of teachers in these schools appeared in the journal. For example, Agnes DeLima said, "we are discovering that newer schools are able to minister better to the emotional and spiritual needs of children . . . we shall hear more about the need of teacher and children together discovering what constitutes the good life and how it may be wisely lived."[53] This rhetorical appeal caused other educators to respond to DeLima's needs of children by also viewing what the teacher can contribute to the child. Florence Cane wrote that the contributions of the teacher are "sympathy, understanding, curiousity, resourcefulness, and a lively imagination."[54] Furthermore, she said, "ultimately we hope the child develops into an active, self-directing entity himself, and dispenses with the teacher entirely."[55] Similarly, Eugene Smith stated the "ideals of progressive education don't do violence to the nature of the child; on the contrary, they stimulate it to the finest growth."[56] Kilpatrick also indicated that "our whole process is always experimental, not dogmatic, always watching, never using roles, but always experimentally trying them out . . . education must be seen as growth in conscious control."[57] Thus, the rhetorical appeals for able and flexible teachers were projected frequently to increase the rhetorical vision among members. Increasingly, more and more teachers began to share in the vision.[58] For example, Harold Shane indicated that "perhaps the greatest need in my work with teaching young children is the need for flexibility both in my mind and in the role of guide to these vital human organisms."[59] Like Shane, many other educators including Baldwin, Groves, Smith, Pricett and Boren expressed similar

ideas. Importantly, each tried to develop related teaching skills to implement the ideas projected rhetorically.

Norms for Action

The rapid development of the sense of community among the members of the movement gave rise to the formation of PEA. The PEA insured the continued exposure of the shared beliefs of the educators in the Progressive Education Movement. As the membership in PEA increased, the recognition of the number of progressive schools increased, for the philosophy and educational practices related to progressive education were exposed in their many workshops, committee and commission reports, annual and regional conventions, and their journal, Progressive Education. Stanwood Cobb spoke of the purpose of the journal by saying:

> The quarterly is offered to members and general public as a means of keeping them in touch with the education movement . . . it's a manisfestation of the desire for better methods of education adapted to the needs of all children of today . . . prior to the movement, few books were read on education--now the great awakening has occurred . . . this journal represents a point midway between magazines which deal with popular issues and journals which deal with pedagogical philosophy.[60]

It was this journal which gave consistent exposure of the philosophy and practices of many progressive educators on a quarterly, then monthly basis. In the initial years it was used to increase membership. For example, Cobb indicated that the association "depended on its members for help and inspiration; the association consists in fact of itself and nothing more."[61] He also gave further suggestions to members and potential members with regard to how they could help the growth of progressive education.

More specifically, he said, "whenever possible take higher membership in the organization, send in names of those interested in becoming members, and send remittance to cover the cost of mailing sample copies to friends who may want to subsribe."[62] Before long, the seven principles of the constitution which appeared in Progressive Education and were developed by PEA members, were recognized. The public schools, private schools and colleges began to indicate their support for the principles and the PEA.

Eugene Smith indicated that the "public schools and private schools gave their endorsement to the fundamental principles for which PEA is working, and the colleges added a note of breadth that's certain to be felt in future years to a constantly increasing extent."[63] With this support and widespread recognition, the PEA and members who contributed to the journal began to inform their audiences of specific philosophies and practices for education. As rhetorical efforts, these intentional actions, development of PEA, the journal and specific information about progressive education advanced the status and strength of the Progressive Education Movement.

As these philosophies and practices were explicated, progressive educators were able to indicate a clear direction for progressive education. For example, the reconstruction of educational practice integrated with social philosophy was advanced. The Committee on Progressive Education indicated that:

> School should be an exemplification of democratic living at its best; there should be greater recognition of cooperation with other social agencies on the part of the educators; if the school is to be an important and integral part of the community, it must be organized in terms of such responsibilities; when educators believe that the

> democratic way is the best way of working together, they will re-make their professional values in these terms; education should deal directly with values individuals hold as they enter educative experiences; educators should be interested in the history of the growth and development of each individual; educators should recognize more clearly that his efforts create active patterns of behavior; educators have the responsibility to help individuals select values and purposes in terms of what may properly be called their surrounding reality . . .[64]

Other educators like Harold Alberty, H. Hullfish, Alice Keliher, Daniel Prescott, Louis Raths, Paul Sears, Paul Witty and Laura Zirbes continued to develop and write about these ideas, too. To foster this atmosphere in the school, the role of the teacher and her contributions were analyzed. Burton Fowler dealt with the former whereas Florence Cane dealt with the latter.

Burton Fowler advanced questions which the teachers should consider. More specifically, he indicated that the teacher should ask, "are we developing among the schools as a group, within our various faculties and among our pupils and parents, a common understanding of the aims of this enterprise?"[65] For more specific information concerning the program he proposed two questions, namely, "have we organization and balance in our curriculum and is this program making sufficient provision for individual difference?"[66] Lastly, he proposed a question that caused educators to continually reflect on their programs, aims, and results, namely, "are we still engrossed in patching together a new crazy quilt of educational fragments--more colorful, perhaps, but, a patchwork all the same?"[67]

Florence Cane contended that the teacher has four main contributions if she is going to foster creativity in each child. More specifically, she indicated that:

> The teacher's first contribution is sympathy, which arises from her love of young, living things . . . this is an active force; its effect on the children is to make them trust her; her second contribution is understanding . . . the third contribution is curiosity; it's the point of view of the laboratory and must proceed from an attitude of detachment . . . one starts by leaving the children somewhat on their own responsibility . . . the fourth requisite is resourcefulness and a lively imagination, the need of constantly discovering new ways of meeting situations as they arise . . . ultimately we hope the child develops into an active, self-directing entity himself, and dispenses with the teacher entirely.[68]

Before long, other educators extended her philosophy by writing handbooks for teacher. For example Robert Lane's, The Progressive Elementary School: A Handbook for Principals, Teachers, and Parents was designed for principals, teachers, and parents. Certainly, these educators hoped that these rhetorical actions, ones which advocated specific philosophies and practices for education would strenghten the Progressive Education Movement. Advocates like these educators, provided a clear perspective for other educators, which resulted in consistency and stability for the movement, and the rise of this movement from local to national recognition. However, not all actions were rhetorically intentional.

A Confusing Rhetoric Within the Progressive Education Movement

The growing concern of social reconstruction along with the emphasis on child-centeredness often caused confusion among members. For example, many educators contended that developing the individual doesn't necessarily insure the development of social consciousness. Thus, they felt that the school had to come to grips with controversial issues which perplexed society; the school had to deal with the changing social order. Although some advocates like George Counts did not confuse the members, other advocates associated with The Social Frontier, which was often viewed as an integral part of Progressive Education, confused members. The latter group advocated drastic social reconstruction, whereas the former did not.

George Counts was appointed the chairman of the Committee on Social and Economic Probelms to "promote within the schools thoughtful and systematic study of the economic and industrial problems confronting us today."[69] Many of the members were satisfied with the formation of this committee. However, they became confused with the more radical advocates, since some of these same educators contributed to both The Social Frontier and Progressive Education. More specifically, they were confused with advocates like Harold Rugg, John Norton, and William Kilpatrick.

Harold Rugg contended that teachers should engage in social reconstruction through education by asking, "what are the concepts and problems of our changing civilization which should constitute a social program of action and the outline of the educational program and what are the elements of a creative philosophy which shall be appropriate for this new social order?"[70] Many educators felt that the child-centeredness was minimized in his proposal. Similarly, John Norton received the same distrust when he proposed that the "time has come when education needs to be tied up more closely with basic social, economic, and political issues than it has in

the past."[71] The failure of many educators to respond to his contentions was the lack of clarity concerning the involvement in social and political issues and the failure to address how child-centeredness fit into these areas. However, Kilpatrick clarified some of these issues when he indicated that "loyalty to progressive education involves loyalty to democratic, economic, social and political arrangements which make it possible . . . hence no sincere friend of progressive education can pretend to be neutral about a struggle in which democracy fights for survival . . ."[72] Kilpatrick's proposal clarified some issues, but many educators still remained somewhat wary of these early advocates of social reconstruction. Although many of these actions were unintentional, the distrust for the so-called radical advocates remained. Certainly, the progressive education movement had to be wary of radical advocates and their affiliation with them if it was to remain financially secure and receive the continued support of its members.

Internal and External Rhetoric of the Organizational Structure of the Progressive Education Movement

The rhetoric of the PEA to clarify the objectives of their programs, practices, committees and commissions related to the growth of the Progressive Education Movement were clear. These attempts were also supported by many members. Thus, the success of the organization's attempts to achieve "effectiveness" was insured due to this clarity and members' support. The effectiveness of this organization is apparent in the "sense of community" among members of the Progressive Education Movement, their shared beliefs, and their mutual norms for action. It is also apparent in the objectives that were stated over the years.

More specifically, educators addressed the questions which educators must remain aware of if the objectives were to be met and the Movement was

to be meaningful. For example, Eugene Smith asked, "does progressive education fit present-day requirements, changing as necessary with changing living conditions and changing needs and does it keep apace with investigation and discovery in the education field, particularly with teaching methods and child psychology?"[73] Additionally, many studies indicated that the schools were successful in their attempts to meet objectives. The Winnetka system, the Dalton Lab Plan, and the "thirty schools" were good indications of this. The conference in Philadelphia also gave "widespread evidence of an interest in progressive education."[74] The effectiveness of PEA continued as interest grew and objectives were increasingly clarified. For example, Morton Snyder spoke to the needs of the school by citing objectives for educators to consider. He argued the continued "personal cooperation of all to make the association and journal an influence in American education, financial support of old and new members, and the advice from progressive experts and leaders working at different levels and divisions of educational systems."[75] Rhetorically, he contended that with these objectives "we shall move forward, always advancing, but never overtaking our opportunity."[76] As the Movement supported new philosophies, other educators began to advance more objectives to provide a clear perspective and direction for educators in the Movement. More specifically, as progressive educators in the Movement became concerned with social implications in education, more objectives were stated. Before long, the rhetoric of educators proposed considerable objectives for social implications in education.

Oscar Chapman advanced four objectives for educators who were concerned with making cooperative individuals in society. He proposed: (1) that education should "clarify the meaning of social crisis; (2) should do a better job assuring an understanding of social questions by the people;

(3) should train for cooperativeness by the method of "learning to live by living," and (4) should prepare people to look upon change as normal."[77] Jesse Newlon in Education for Democracy of Our Time and A. K. King in Teachers for Democracy addressed similar objectives for social implications in education.

Certainly, these educators who clarified objectives for progressive education provided both a clear perspective and a direction for members of PEA. The norms for action indicated previously were often prefaced by objectives. The support for these objectives was also evidenced in the increasing number of members in PEA, the increase of progressive schools, and the mutual support of these ideas among members. Thus, the support for these objectives work to mobilize the "sense of community" among members.

The Inherent Conflict Between the Organization and the Nature of the Individuals

Throughout the 1920's and 1930's the PEA was able to effectively sustain old members and attract new members to the Progressive Education Movement. The new philosophies and practices stated by PEA in their journal and committees continued to be emphasized in several educational institutions and progressive schools. However, when the philosophy related to child-centeredness became dominated by social reconstruction concerns, members of the Progressive Education Movement became confused. The confusion led to fragmentation within the Movement and eventually the deterioration of it, or what Griffin calls the period of consummation. More specifically, this confusion was due in part to the differences in ideas concerning social reconstruction as perceived by those educators who contributed to Progressive Education and those who contributed to The Social Frontier.[78] For example, Kilpatrick who once indicated that "only as the whole child is given all-round experience can we hope to build the richer and finer personalities that we all wish . . . this is the program of progressive education,"

now advocated other ideas.[79] He began to emphasize a social philosophy for progressive education in his rhetoric. His primary contributions were found in The Social Frontier rather than Progressive Education, and the membership began to associate Kilpatrick with the revolutionary group. They found him arguing:

> Children in education as they grow older should be able to make the following extensions in general succession: from themselves as mere individuals to small group play, to larger play groups, to team play, to the school, class, to the organized school, to socially useful work in the community, to the larger community, to the state, to the political nation, to the social-economic system and its injustices, to ethics as a matter of conscious study, to institutions in general and how they work, to international relations, to war, to collective security.[80]

When Kilpatrick began to contribute to Progressive Education, many issues between members in PEA concerning the scope and purposes of PEA in relation to the Progressive Education Movement developed. For example, Ann Crockett, who taught for ten years in a progressive high school, criticized the educators involved in PEA at the time by indicating that "like most reformers, the progressivists jumped on too many horses and rode off in too many directions."[81] The aims and principles which had strengthened the Progressive Education Movement were gradually disappearing in light of issues concerning social reconstruction. By the 1940's as the end of WWII appeared to be close at hand, educators became very disenchanted with these so-called revolutionaries. There was rhetoric which attempted to revive the intense commitment of educators. John Norton argued to educators to revise the "purposes, organization, and methods of procedure of the educational

associations and organizations of this country."[82] Similarly, Taba indicated that the "demand that education assume a constructive and active role in social reconstruction requires a definite clarification of social and educational ideology and perhaps a formulation of new directives."[83] Although these appeals were made, few educators were willing to commit themselves as they had in the first few decades of the Progressive Education Movement. Certainly, the lack of commitment was due in part to the issues concerning social reconstruction and its implications for progressive education. However, it was also due to the cultural and economic forces related to the war.

Cultural and Economic Forces

By 1942, many educators indicated that the PEA was at a crucial point in its history because of the cultural and economic forces, the lack of support, and the stagnation of the movement. Carleton Washburne indicated that:

> The PEA is at a crucial point--it either is going to take active leadership in helping America and other nations reorganize education in terms of the great responsibilities that confront us in winning the war and especially in post-war reconstruction, or it's going to become an innocuous and vaguely helpful remnant of a once-powerful organization . . . which course it will follow will depend on the type of leadership you help to elect and the amount of local leadership and vision you exercise.[84]

Before long, other teachers in progressive schools began to voice similar concerns. More specifically, Jeanne Etheridge indicated that in "communities where war brings families to stay for short period of time, overcrowding the small classrooms, the teacher feels overwhelmed by new

conditions . . . teachers who once taught small children under more or less ideal conditions where the growth of individuals and the development of fine relationships were possible, now finds herself frustrated . . ."[85] Other teachers, Dorothea Jackson, Kate Watanabe, and Elizabeth Parmelee also indicated that they faced similar conditions. The ultimate frustration of the teachers in progressive school became apparent in their frequent questions, "what can we cling to and what can we teach that will survive?"[86] The following year was a further indication of the decline of the Progressive Education Movement due to the cultural and economic forces. Vinal Tibbets, the president of the PEA argued that:

> The war is taking a toll on all of us . . . it discourages once courageous teachers. The press of personal problems and the absorption of every individual in war activities might make it all too easy to slip back into the "tried and true" of the past--might, in answer to the cry for more formal discipline and the glorification of the three R's, make us retreat to the alleged safety of the trite and traditional.[87]

He also made a final rhetorical appeal to PEA members by contending that "our duty is clear . . . serve all the children of all the people . . . join us in a re-dedication to the idea of education born a quarter of a century ago . . . by redoubling its efforts, the association will service the children and youth of our land. . . it'll be a great fight--will you join it?"[88] Four years later, a similar "call to unite" was repeated by John DeBoer when he indicated that the "temper of American Education Fellowship . . . calls for courageous advances . . . it calls for unified action against the evils and perils that confront the people of the world today."[89] However, the call to unite came too late. Unfortunately, the

parents of many children in the progressive schools who were once satisfied and supportive of progressive education were now dissatisfied. More specifically, these parents once said, "you are a progressive association . . . we parents and students of society ask you to give us leadership, young, aggressive, fearless . . . take our dreams and our children and build with them and for them, a finer thing even than we dream."[90] Now the parents argued their dissatisfaction by saying that their children "weren't being taught the fundamental skills, particularly in reading and arithmetic . . . too much time during school hours is spent in play . . ."[91] Many teachers became intimidated by this school-community relationship, and began to use the philosophy and practices of progressive education less and less.[92] Thus, the decline of the progressive era began.

The progressive education era which was awakened by many educators committed intensely to the advancement of new philosophies and practices in education had ended by the early 1950's. The many educators whose spirit and commitment pervaded the progressive schools were replaced by educators who were committed to a basic or fundamental approach to education. The direction for education in terms of philosophy and practices changed drastically. Since this era, educators have continued to experiment with many innovational ideas and practices. However, educators' widespread and intense commitment to a common cause, like the Progressive Education Movement still waits to be awakened, and the use of substantive and appealing rhetoric through mobilization of collective action can be instrumental in creating such an awakening.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Leland Griffin, "The Rhetoric of Historical Movements," Quarterly Journal of Speech, April (1974), 165-174.

[2]Ralph R. Smith and Russel R. Windes, "The Innovational Movement: A Rhetorical Theory," Quarterly Journal of Speech, April (1975), 140-142.

[3]Wayne Brockriede, "Rhetorical Criticism as Argument," Quarterly Journal of Speech, April (1974), 166.

[4]Ralph R. Smith and Russel R. Windes, p. 142.

[5]Patricia Graham, Progressive Education: From Arcady to Academe. New York, 1967, p. 1.

[6]Patricia Graham, p. 6.

[7]For example, the development of the Winnetka School, Moraine Park Country Day School, and Park School were largely initiated by parents.

[8]Patricia Graham, p. 16.

[9]Patricia Graham, p. 24.

[10]Patricia Graham, p. 25.

[11]Patricia Graham, p. 28.

[12]Patricia Graham, p. 33.

[13]Patricia Graham, p. 38.

[14]Patricia Graham, p. 48.

[15]Patricia Graham, p. 58.

[16]Patricia Graham, p. 59.

[17]Patricia Graham, p. 87.

[18]Interview with Dr. Robert Jewett, Professor of Humanities Education, The Ohio State University, 1976. Jewett indicated that educators literally "flocked" to universities such as Ohio State University, Columbia Teachers College and Stanford to participate in summer workshops headed by nationally-known educators. More specifically, Dr. Jewett indicated that William Kilpatrick, who offered one of these summer programs was one of the most popular and well known educators in the progressive movement. Dr. Jewett also indicated that these summer workshops were based on the predominant philosophy of education associated with the Progressive Education Movement and how to implement this philosophy in present-day education. The groups in these summer workshops were highly committed to the clarification of both of these tasks. This committal was typified by compositions of songs relating to the growth of the movement (e.g., Dr. Jewett indicated that there was one which paralleled the Climbing of Jacob's Ladder).

Due to the number of people who attended and who were so committed, Dr. Jewett contended that there was a good possibility that even more people and schools than those which were cited in the literature (books, journals) could have been affected by the ideas of the Progressive Education Movement.

[19]Patricia Graham, p. 90.

[20]Patricia Graham, p. 98.

[21]George S. Counts, "Dare Progressive Education Be Progressive?" Progressive Education, April (1932), 257-263.

[22]Patricia Graham, p. 67.

[23]Patricia Graham, p. 67.

[24]Committee of the Progressive Education Association on Social and Economic Problems, George S. Counts, Chairman, "A Call to Teachers of the Nation," New York, 1933, p. 26.

[25]"Report of the Resolutions Committee," Progressive Education, April (1938), 282.

[26]"Report of the Resolutions Committee," pp. 282-283.

[27]Patricia Graham, p. 103.

[28]Patricia Graham, p. 106.

[29]Patricia Graham, p. 14.

[30]In an interview with Dr. Jewett, he indicated that this was apparent among many educators. He also indicated that people even stopped subscribing to the Progressive Education journal, for fear of being associated with a movement they once supported with intense and high commitments.

[31]Interview with Dr. Jewett.

[32]Ralph Smith and Russell Windes, p. 111.

[33]Gertrude Hartman, "The Significance of the New Education," Progressive Education, Oct.-Nov.-Dec. (1924), 123.

[34]Frederick Bonser, "Ten Years of Progress in Elementary Education," Progressive Education, Jan.-Feb.-March (1929), 12.

[35]Adolphe Ferriere, "What is the New School?" Progressive Education, Oct.-Nov.-Dec. (1924), 154.

[36]Francis Froelicher, "The Philadelphia Conference," Progressive Education, July-Aug.-Sept. (1925), 133.

[37]Francis Froelicher, "A Liberality of Spirit," Progressive Education, July-Aug.-Sept. (1927), 150.

[38]Hugh Mearns, "The Creative Spirit and Its Significance for Education," Progressive Education, April-May-June (1926), 101-102.

[39]Neil J. Smelzer, Theory of Collective Behavior. New York, 1962, p. 79.

[40]William Kilpatrick, "What Do We Mean by Progressive Education?" Progressive Education, Dec. (1930), 385.

[41]George Counts, "Dare Progressive Education Be Progressive?" April (1932), 257.

[42]Eugene Smith, "The Teacher in a Progressive School," Progressive Education, March (1931), 203.

[43]George Mirick, Progressive Education, New York, 1923, pp. 152-153.

[44]George Mirick, p. 136.

[45]Robert Lane, The Progressive Elementary School: A Handbook for Principals, Teachers, and Parents, New York, 1938, p. 1.

[46]Stanwood Cobb, The New Leaven, New York, 1928, p. 13.

[47]Stanwood Cobb, p. 247.

[48]Gertrude Hartman, "The Changing Conception of the Curriculum," Progressive Education, July-Aug.-Sept. (1924), 59-60.

[49]Gertrude Hartman, p. 60.

[50]Stanwood Cobb, "Retrospect and Prospect," Progressive Education, July-Aug.-Sept. (1927), 152.

[51]John Dewey, "The Significance of the New Education," Progressive Education, Oct.-Nov.-Dec, (1924), 123.

[52]Eugene Smith, "The 1925 Conference," Progressive Education, July-Aug.-Sept. (1925), 131.

[53]Agnes DeLima, "Democracy in the Classroom," Progressive Education March (1931), 198.

[54]Florence Cane, "Fostering Creative Work," Progressive Education March (1931), 199-202.

[55]Florence Cane, p. 202.

[56]Eugene Smith, "The Teacher in a Progressive School," 206.

[57]William Kilpatrick, "A Theory of Progressive Education to Fit the Times," Progressive Education, April (1931), 292.

[58]Ernest G. Bormann, "Fantasy and Rhetorical Vision: The Rhetorical Criticism of Social Reality," Quarterly Journal of Speech (1972), 397.

[59]Harold Shane, "Flexibility," Progressive Education, April (1939), 252.

[60]Stanwood Cobb, "The New Quarterly," Progressive Education, April (1924), 3-4.

[61]Stanwood Cobb, "1924-1925," Progressive Education, Jan.-Feb.-March (1925), 4.

[62]Stanwood Cobb, p. 4.

[63]Eugene Smith, "The 1925 Conference," Progressive Education, July-Aug.-Sept. (1925), 131.

[64]"Committee on Progressive Education," Yearbook Supplement, 23-28.

[65]Burton Fowler, "Six Questions for the Thirty Schools," Progressive Education, May (1936), 334-335.

[66]Fowler, pp. 334-335.

[67]Fowler, p. 335.

[68]Florence Cane, "Fostering Creative Work," pp. 199-201.

[69]Wilford Aikin, "The Association Faces its Opportunities," Progressive Education, May (1932), 330.

[70]Harold Rugg, "Social Reconstruction Through Education," Progressive Education, Dec. (1932), 11.

[71]John K. Norton, "Getting the Schools Out of the Bread-line: A Plea for National Educational Reconstruction," Progressive Education, October (1933), 305.

[72]William Kilpatrick, "Progressive Education and the War," The Social Frontier, Dec. (1940), 69.

[73]Eugene Smith, "A Message from the President of the Progressive Education Association," Progressive Education, April (1924), 5.

[74]Francis Froelicher, "The Philadelphia Conference," Progressive Education, July-Aug.-Sept. (1925), '33.

[75]Morton Snyder, "Progressive Education-Progress and Prospect," Progressive Education, April-May-June (1926), 195.

[76]Snyder, p. 195.

[77]Oscar Chapman, "Education and the Social Crisis," Progressive Education, January (1936), 8.

[78]In an interview with Dr. Jewett, he indicated that the educators associated with Progressive Education were considered reformers or reconstructionists whereas the educators associated with The Social Frontier were considered revolutionaires. Since many of the educators associated with The Social Frontier also contributed to Progressive Education, many members became confused, then concerned that PEA was changing its philosophies and practices, specifically ideas concerning radical social

reconstruction in educational settings. Thus, the status and strength of PEA began to diminish.

[79]William Kilpatrick, "What Do We Mean by Progressive Education?" Progressive Education, Dec. (1930), 386.

[80]William Kilpatrick, "The World Today: A Positive Program for Education," Progressive Education, May (1941), 230.

[81]Graham, Progressive Education: From Arcady to Academe, p. 102.

[82]John K. Norton, "Getting the Schools Out of the Bread-line: A Plea for National Educational Reconstruction," p. 305.

[83]Hilda Taba, "Progressive Education--What Now?" Progressive Education, March (1934), 162.

[84]Carleton Washburne, "Progressive Education Association," Progressive Education, November (1942), 355.

[85]Jeanne Etheridge, "Conditions Teachers Face," Progressive Education, May (1943), 234.

[86]Virginia Sparklin, "The Morale of Teachers," Progressive Education, May (1943), 236.

[87]Vinal Tibbets, "What is the Job?" Progressive Education, Oct. (1943), 255.

[88]Tibbets, p. 255.

[89]John DeBoer, "Welcome, Progressive!" Progressive Education, Nov. (1947), 257.

[90]Robert Lynd, "Education and Some Realities of American Life," Progressive Education, May (1930), 179.

[91]Walter Anderson, "A Look at Progressive Schools," Progressive Education, November (1949), 43.

[92]In an interview with Dr. Jewett, he emphasized the fact that teachers were very apprehensive about using the philosophies and practices associated with the Progressive Education Movement. More specifically, he contended that "what was once the thing to do and talk about (namely progressive education) was now the thing not to do." He also indicated that many educators also began to discontinue their subscription to Progressive Education. Furthermore, he said, "the only people who continued to subscribe were affiliated with libraries."